

Appl. No. 09/829,054  
Amdt. Dated May 4, 2005  
Reply to Office action of February 10, 2005  
Attorney Docket No. P14688-US1  
EUS/J/P/05-3108

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

#### **Claim Amendments**

The Applicant has amended claims 2, 5, 8 and 10 and claim 1 has been canceled. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 2-14 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

#### **Examiner Objections -- Specification**

The abstract was objected to because it is not in narrative form and is not within the range of 50 to 150 words. The Applicant thanks the Examiner for his careful review of the specification. In response, the Applicant has modified the abstract as suggested by the Examiner. The Examiner's consideration of the amendments to the abstract is respectfully requested.

#### **Examiner Objections - Claims**

Claims 2-4 and 6-8 were objected to as to being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Applicant has canceled claim 1 and rewritten claim 2, which contains allowable subject matter, to include all the limitations of claim 1.

#### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)**

Claims 1 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vileid et al. (US 6,778,500 hereinafter Vileid) in view of the applicant's admitted prior art (hereinafter APPA). In order to expedite allowance of this application, the Applicant has canceled claim 1 without prejudice and amended claim 2 to include the limitations of the base claim. Claim 5 now depends from claim 2 which contains allowable subject matter. Therefore, this rejection with respect to these claims is deemed to be moot. The Applicant has amended claims 2, 5, 8 and 10 to better define

Appl. No. 09/629,054  
Amtd. Dated May 4, 2005  
Reply to Office action of February 10, 2005  
Attorney Docket No. P14688-US1  
EUS/J/P/05-3108

the intended scope of the claimed invention. The Examiner's consideration of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

The Applicant gratefully acknowledges the allowance of claims 9-14.

The Applicant notes with appreciation the conditional allowance of claims 2-4 and 6-8. As the Examiner has suggested, claim 2 has been rewritten in independent form including all limitation of the base claims and any intervening claims. Therefore no amendments have been made to narrow the scope of the pending claims or to create any sort of estoppel.

Claims 3-8 depend from amended claim 2 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 2. Therefore, the allowance of claims 2-14 is respectfully requested.

### **Prior Art Not Relied Upon**

In paragraph 6 on page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner stated that the prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the Applicant's disclosure.

Appl. No. 09/829,054  
Amtd. Dated May 4, 2005  
Reply to Office action of February 10, 2005  
Attorney Docket No. P14688-US1  
EUS/J/P/05-3108

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



By Sidney L. Weatherford  
Registration No. 45,602

Date: May 4, 2005

Ericsson Inc.  
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11  
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-8656  
sidney.weatherford@ericsson.com